LATIN AS THE INTERNATIONAL AUXILIARY LANGUAGE

By Roland G. Kent

Professor of Comparative Philology
University of Pennsylvania

1. The need of an International Auxiliary Language.

We who live in the United States of America, and speak English by right of inheritance, are too prone to think our mother tongue sufficient for all purposes; even our educational authorities begrudge the time spent in school, on foreign languages. We can, it is true, travel from one end to the other of our country, and through Canada, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, always finding English the normal language of the land, except in a few scattered localities. We can spend our time in Japan or in India or in Egypt or in Mexico or in Rome, Paris, Berlin, or other large cities, and if we keep in the beaten track we find that English will serve our purposes. Now it is fair to demand that a permanent resident, whether holding citizen rights or not, should acquire the normal language of the country in which he resides; but the transient who allows his travels or business in a foreign land to be made possible by the additional languages learned by others, must pay for it directly or indirectly, since the attendants in hotels, in railway offices, and in business shops do not commonly learn foreign tongues from purely altruistic motives—nor should they be expected to do so. Knowledge is money, as well as power; and even though the knowledge of English is widespread, the writer has repeatedly spent weeks at a stretch when he heard not a word of English except from a stray English or American traveler—and this, too, in much frequented countries.

Published by the American Classical League. Single copies, 20 cents; 4 copies for 50 cents; 10 copies for $1.00. Apply to Andrew F. West, Princeton, New Jersey.

Travelers and business men, then, need a means of international communication; so likewise do the statesmen. We have in recent years seen a series of great conferences, on which the welfare of the world hung, or seemed to hang; and the Council of the League of Nations is now functioning. What shall be the language employed in such gatherings? Occasionally it happens that some one language is spoken with ease and accuracy by one or more representatives of every important nation concerned; but this is not always so. At one recent conference, Italy was placed at a great disadvantage because she alone, of the nations there assembled, had no spokesman who was master of English.

Scholars and men of science and of the learned professions need a language in common, both for international meetings and for publications. At a meeting some years ago, an American scholar read a paper in English, to which all listened politely, but few with understanding; when he sat down, one of his colleagues rose and under guise of discussing the paper gave a résumé of its contents, in German, that at least some others might know of what he had been speaking. As for publication, a universally intelligible medium would enable the engineer, the physician, the historian, and all others, in fact, to have at command the advances in their own subjects, by the mastery of one language in addition to their native tongue; and the expense of printing important discoveries in many languages, for the benefit of all, would be eliminated.

Apart from the traveler and the business man, the statesman, the scholar, the scientist, and the professional man, we may add the need of a means of communication in writing and in print, between chance persons of different countries. For mutual comprehension between such persons, and between others who may wish to exchange thoughts by word of mouth, is the most powerful single factor for international good-will, good-will of the kind that smoothes out misunderstandings and destroys those ill feelings and dislikes which, when grown to their full development, make war possible, or even cause war. What except our mutual understanding, made possible by the use of one and the same language, has enabled us to live peacefully with our Canadian neighbors, without fear of attack

and with an unfortified frontier, for over one hundred years? Yet there have been causes of irritation, more than once, at least as great as those which, in other conditions, have produced hostilities. But the Canadians and the people of the United States understand and therefore trust each other.

II. What is an International Auxiliary Language?

It is the presence of many languages in the different portions of the world which is the obstacle to international understanding. This obstacle can be overcome only by the acceptance, consciously or subconsciously, of some one language to be learned by all men, or by all men who learn any second language, in addition to their mother tongue. There have been such international languages in the past. Aramaic had much currency at the east end of the Mediterranean, some centuries before the Christian era. Greek, already widespread, received an enormous extension by the conquests of Alexander, and is still largely used over an immense territory, for commercial purposes. Latin was carried from Rome over all Europe south and west of the Danube and the Rhone, over Britain, over North Africa, and over Asia to the Euphrates River; it was the language of government, and became the vernacular in many lands, though Greek, as the language of commerce, withstood it in the Orient. Latin was for centuries the language of international relations, and was the language of university instruction and of all learned writing until a comparatively recent date; it is still the official language of the Roman Catholic Church. Arabic was carried by the Mohammedans over great parts of three continents, and is still the official language of their religion. A little later, a mixed language based on French was current around the Mediterranean, giving us the term *lingua franca* for any international tongue. French itself became widely used, especially as a language of international diplomacy and of polite society, in which uses it has never been displaced, although English is seriously threatening its status. English has in the last three centuries spread over a great part of the world, and is the preferred foreign language of Egypt, Japan, and China; it is the recognized international language of the sea. There are other languages with international uses,

but it is needless to list them. Enough has been said to show that the idea of a definitely recognized international language is nothing new nor alarming.

The object of our quest is, however, not an international language, but an international *auxiliary* language; and it is qualified with the word *auxiliary* because it is not intended to displace any existing national language. The result of the World War has been to intensify the national spirit of smaller linguistic areas, and to revivify some languages which seemed moribund. It would be invidious to name them; the result is certainly detrimental to the mutual intelligibility of men. But in seeking an IAL, as for brevity we shall hereafter call the international auxiliary language, it is impracticable to run counter to national prejudices; and in any case, if we can get an auxiliary means of communication, everywhere used, it makes no difference what tongue may be the normal speech of the locality. Neither does the IAL seek to displace any existing means of international communication, such as French in diplomacy and English in commerce, except so far as this may come about by natural selection, with the lapse of time. The IAL is designed distinctly to be an *auxiliary,* but capable of use in all countries and by all men who wish to exchange ideas.

III. The Qualifications for the IAL.

It is clear that we may at the outset define the qualifications for the IAL, though we cannot expect the language chosen for this use to be perfect on all points; but our choice must be a language clearly preferable to competitors, when its satisfaction of the various demands is considered as a whole. The most important of these qualifications are the following:

1. The sounds must be easy for most persons to make.
2. The spelling and the pronunciation must be in agreement.
3. The word roots or bases must be easy to learn and to understand.
4. The forms must be easy to learn and to understand.
5. The syntax must be easy to learn and to understand.
6. The spoken language must convey a precise meaning to the hearer, without ambiguity.

7. Other special values inherent in any language should be taken into account.

Other points, such as brevity and euphony, may be desirable, but cannot be considered essential.

IV. The Possibilities for the IAL.

There are three kinds of languages from which the IAL may be chosen:

A. A modern language which is the vernacular of some nation or people; the possible selections are English, French, Spanish, German.

B. An artificial language, made mainly with this end in view; the most important candidates are Esperanto and Ido, and some simplified form of Latin, such as Peano's Interlingua.

C. A language no longer used as the vernacular of a nation; we need consider only Latin, since Greek in its ancient form and Sanskrit are obviously less well adapted for use as the IAL.

V. The Modern Languages.

Let us consider the claims of the four modern languages which have been named, in order.

A. English, as has already been said, is very widely used in many portions of the world, partly as a result of political and governmental conditions, but more largely as the result of commerce. It seems as if natural processes would make English the IAL within the present century if nobody consciously interfered with its development.[1] But since the problem has been taken up deliberately, we must consider the claims of English on its abstract merits. The sounds of English are not remarkably difficult, but include the two *th* sounds, as in *then* and *thin,* which are difficult for the speakers of many tongues, and many heavy consonant groups, as in *frosts* and *strength,* which are not easy for most men. The vowels also are abnormal, both as regards the correspondence of written letter and spoken sound (English represents by *e,* for example, approximately the sound for which French, Spanish,

[1]An attempt to adapt English for use as the IAL, in a form called *Cosmo English,* is being made by Mr. J. W. Hamilton, Secretary of the Magna Charta Day Association, 147 Kent St., St. Paul, Minn.

Italian, German, etc., write *i*), and in the diphthongal vanish at the end of the "long" vowels. The orthography varies about as far as is possible from the phonetic standard. The fewness of inflectional endings places an undue burden on position as a factor in conveying the meaning (*overlook this paper; look over this paper; look this paper over*) and causes many words to be used as more than one part of speech without change of form (*fall,* noun and verb; *kindly,* adjective and adverb; *but,* conjunction, preposition, adverb). Ambiguities are seen in compounds whose parts are written as separate words without even hyphens (*a modern English grammar, a tall man's hat*). The vocabulary is difficult, because the derivative words are often formed from the Latin words, while the primitives are Saxon or much altered Latin: *life,* but *vital*; *time* and *tense,* but *temporal.* On the other hand, English has the advantages of its defects: it offers few forms to learn, and few rules of syntax, and has an ample and precise vocabulary of which the greater part, being derived from Latin and Greek, is similar to the words of other languages. The case against English is, however, decided by existing national rivalries, and the fear that the worldwide use of English would give the English-speaking nations an undue advantage in foreign trade.

B. FRENCH deserves careful consideration, because of its wide use for centuries in diplomatic relations and in polite society. But the sounds are very difficult for most foreigners, especially the nasal vowels and the *eu* and *u*; the orthography and the pronunciation are almost as far apart as in English; the syntax, especially of the pronouns, the negatives, and the subjunctive, is far from easy. The *liaison* of the words in the sentence requires rapid utterance, and thus makes the understanding of it less easy. But the vocabulary is ample and precise, as in English, and the feeling of jealousy is less strong towards French than towards English.

C. SPANISH is spoken in large sections of the world, and has an almost phonetic orthography. The chief handicaps to its adoption are that it employs very many difficult idiomatic expressions, and that comparatively few persons outside Spanish-speaking lands have cared to learn the language; but great numbers learn English, French, and German, to

whom those languages are not their native tongue. Thus Spanish, as a starting-point, is hampered by a lack of *clientèle,* so to speak, and a lack of enough enthusiastic partisans.

D. GERMAN can make its claims as the language of much valuable technical literature, and is widely spoken in Central and Eastern Europe, even where it is not the native language. It is handicapped by having many difficult sounds, such as the *ch,* the *ö,* the *ü,* and heavy consonant groups; by a very inelastic and illogical word order; and by the enmities left behind by the World War, which alone would put it out of consideration for a long time to come.

VI. THE ARTIFICIAL LANGUAGES.

We must under this heading consider Esperanto, Ido, and some simplified Latin such as Interlingua.

A. ESPERANTO, an invention of Dr. Zamenhof, is a serious attempt to fulfill the requirements of a universal language for auxiliary use. Its grammatical apparatus is very simple, consisting of seventeen endings, besides a few prefixes, numerous suffixes, and complete freedom in making noun compounds. The alphabet is completely phonetic and the accent is always on the penult. But certain of the sounds are ill chosen, since they are difficult for speakers of certain languages: *c,* with a circumflex over it, sounded like English *ch,* is strange to the French and to the Greeks; *c,* sounded like English *ts,* is a strange combination to the French and the Spanish, and, at the beginning of a word, to the English; *g* with the circumflex, sounded like English *j,* is strange to the French, the Spanish, the Germans, and the Greeks; *j* with the circumflex, sounded like French *j,* is strange to the Germans, the Italians, the Greeks, and the Spanish, and rare in English; *h* with the circumflex, sounded like German *ch,* is strange to the English, the French, and the Italians; *s* with the circumflex, sounded like English *sh,* is strange to the Spanish and the Greeks. The diphthongs *eu* and *uj* are difficult for most nations, but do not often occur. The use of the circumflex over five letters (*c g h j s*) to denote modifications in the sounds, makes typesetting needlessly difficult; so does the use of the breve over *u* (*ŭ*) when it is the second element of a diphthong. The use of *j* with

the sound of *y* and as the second element of diphthongs is awkward to speakers of English, of French, and of Spanish, at least. The use of *c* in the sound *ts* is awkward, though *c* before palatal vowels becomes some sibilant in most languages; even in this position, the value *ts* is restricted to German. When we find *colo* 'inch' and *amikeco* 'friendship,' it is difficult to realize that *c* stands for *ts*. Such a value of the letter is found only in Slavonic languages.

The vocabulary might be better chosen. As the inventor of Esperanto had complete freedom to choose his words, he should have selected them on the principle of *maximum internationality*; that is, he should have chosen a form which would be familiar to the speakers of as many different languages as possible. On this basis, *kamelo* 'camel' is well chosen, but *nur* 'only' and *kaj* 'and' are not, since they appeal only to the German and the Greek respectively. Dr. Zamenhof, however, seems to have attempted to enlist the support of speakers of different tongues, by including a few words from every language of importance in Europe; the remainder conforms approximately to the principle of maximum internationality.

One main claim of the Esperantists is that Esperanto has no idiom which must be learned as English *there is,* French *il y a,* German *es gibt* must be learned. It is a question whether this is a merit. The IAL is, in the final analysis, intended for the use of persons who know only their mother tongues and the IAL; if they know other languages, that is a fortuitous circumstance. Now in what way can such persons eliminate the idioms from their own language before they turn it into Esperanto? And if they do not, the Esperanto is quite unintelligible in spots. I have found phrases in Esperanto which I could not understand until I had put them into German, which was evidently the language of the writer. The result is that despite the claim of lack of idiom the Esperantists have been obliged to create idiomatic expressions, of which they confess to about one hundred; thus English *three years ago* becomes Esperanto *antaŭ tri jaroj,* which is clear enough to a German and to an educated Greek, but is baffling to an Englishman, a Frenchman, a Spaniard, or an Italian, except as

an idiom.[1] And how would a man who knew but English and Esperanto express the English *step on the gas,* in Esperanto? The fact that few Esperantists are of this one-language type, merely weakens the case for the use of Esperanto.

Even the normal syntax of Esperanto has its anomalies: there is an accusative case form, used as the object of verbs and as to denote motion toward; but the nominative case is used as the object of a preposition, unless there is the idea of motion toward.

The simplicity and brevity of the grammatical apparatus is not an unmixed blessing, for a single sound is often so heavily charged with meaning that an undue speed in comprehension is demanded; for example, *mi estas amita* means 'I have been loved,' and *mi estas aminta* means 'I have loved,' and *skribas skribis skribos skribus* are respectively present, past, future, and conditional of the verb to write, the characteristic vowel of the tense being in the unaccented syllable. As the chief difficulty in understanding a foreign language is the speed with which it is spoken, this very brevity of the endings, which facilitates rapid utterance and demands more rapid understanding on the part of the hearer, results in making Esperanto more difficult to understand.

Another great handicap on the part of Esperanto, which can be explained only by the fact that its inventor was accustomed to the compound suffixation of German and of the Slavic languages, consists in its system of derivative suffixes, with a few prefixes, capable of infinite combination: thus a *doctor's wife* is a *san-ig-ist-edz-in-o,* made of the root *san* 'health,' and the suffixes *ig* causative, *ist* the agent, *edz* a married person, *in* feminine, *o* substantive. Would a *san-ig-edz-ist-in-o* be a *married woman-doctor,* and a *san-ig-ist-in-edz-o* be a *woman-doctor's husband*? Surely it is difficult to grasp with proper rapidity the meaning of such words; and whether or not the last two words have the suggested meanings (the writer does

[1]The beloved term of the Esperantists for themselves, *samideanoj,* means 'partisans of the same idea,' and its application to Esperantists rather than to Mohammedans or to a happy married couple is a good instance of the conventionalized meanings against which they inveigh so heartily. To the writer, on the other hand, it is the one bright spot in a dull and colorless waste!

not feel sure about it), certainly the cumbersome method illustrated by the first example is distinctly inferior to the analytic phrases of other languages. Another example: *mal-san-ul-ar-o* means 'hospital inmates,' from *mal* negative, *san* health, *ul* characterized by, *ar* collective, *o* substantive, = 'collection of those characterized by ill-health.' But where is the idea of presence in a hospital indicated? Why does the word not mean rather the invalids in their own homes? A hospital is a *san-ig-ej-o* 'health-making-place'; why not say *sanigejularo* for 'hospital inmates'? But no, that might mean the nurses and the interns, for it means a 'collection of those characterized by a hospital.' Subjective specialization at once enters into the interpretation of such words, which illustrates the pitfalls of a language without an objective standard of meaning.[1]

B. Ido is a reformed type of Esperanto. It avoids the English *j* and the German *ch* sounds entirely, and writes *ch, sh, y, x,* in the English values; it uses *j* for the French *j,* and *u* without diacritical mark as the second part of diphthongs. It avoids diphthongs in *i*. Thus most of the disadvantages of the Esperantist alphabet and sound-system are avoided; but it still has *c* in the value *ts,* and the diphthong *eu,* and the accent varies in position. The endings are slightly increased in number, and are made more precise in meaning, and therefore more difficult for the ordinary person to employ freely. The formation of the passive by an infixed *es* before other endings is a very strange variation from the normal use of an auxiliary in Esperanto, as in most modern languages. The accusative case is abolished. Otherwise the grammatical structure remains the same. The vocabulary is, however, selected strictly on the principle of maximum internationality; and the result is that almost every word is familiar to him who knows Latin and French. For the plain truth is, that practically all the words which have spread from language to language and become international, started from Latin; and thus the vocabulary of Ido has the ap-

[1]For these and similar examples, cf. W. J. Clark, *International Language*[2], London, Dent, 1912, especially pp. 156-157 and the first paragraph on p. 154.

pearance of being that of an unfamiliar language of the Romance group.[1]

With these changes, what has been said of Esperanto applies to Ido; which means that Ido fulfills better than Esperanto the conditions for the IAL. But in the present state of affairs, Esperanto has such a lead over Ido in the race that Ido cannot be taken as a serious competitor.

C. As a type of numerous attempts in the same line, we may take the *Latino sine flexione* or, as it is now called, INTERLINGUA, arranged by Professor Peano of Turin, who has for some time published in this medium. It is essentially the use of Latin stems bereft of their endings, and may be illustrated by this extract:

"Post que nos habe transito uno vico grande, nos videba campos de mais, pascuos, et silvas, sed nullo homine durante horas; et uno poteba admira natura in toto suo solitudine imponente."

This denaturalized Latin would be easy enough for a Latinist to write, but not easy for others; and the writer would prefer almost anything else as an IAL. It has but two advantages: it is easy to understand, and the words have the definiteness of meaning which Latin words have.

No other simplified form of Latin has attained a status which makes it worthy of serious consideration.

VII. THE "DEAD" LANGUAGES.

Of the so-called dead languages, Latin is the only one which makes serious claims on our attention. Greek in its ancient form and Sanskrit, though culturally of great importance, could not meet the demands of an IAL.

LATIN has an entirely phonetic alphabet, with no peculiar symbols or diacritical marks; the sounds, except for the rare *eu* and *ui*, are easy to the speakers of most languages—though this depends somewhat upon the system of pronunciation which may be adopted, as we shall see in a later part of this discussion.

[1]For a critique of Ido by an Esperantist, see Dr. de Saussure's *Vort-Teorio en Esperanto;* for a critique of Esperanto by the Idist leader, see Dr. Couturat's *La Réforme justifiée.* A new project, to reunite the two, is ESPERANTIDA (central office at 8 Marienstrasse, Bern, Switzerland).

The accent is not so easily placed as in Esperanto, where it always stands on the penult; but its position in most words can be described in a few simple rules, and in the exceptions an accent mark might be set, as in Spanish. The word bases or roots include nearly all of those which have spread from language to language and achieved international intelligibility, and have therefore an almost maximum internationality without undergoing any process of artificial selection. Take for example such words as *superintendent, senate, verify, notice, state, butter,* which are found in but slightly changed form in many languages; all come from Latin, the last one coming earlier into Latin from Greek.

The forms of Latin are more numerous than those of the artificial languages, but have the advantage of greater precision of meaning; and the greater length of the endings allows the hearer more time to appreciate their value. Syntax also is more complicated, but this allows greater exactness in the expression of the thought, when that is desired; and where there is no need of fine discriminations, Latin can be expressed in short and simple clauses, with only an occasional subordinating word. Similarly, in English conversation, we rarely use subordinating elements except the relative pronoun, the conjunctions *that, if, when, because,* and, less often, an indirect interrogative; even these can in many instances be avoided. Latin can be phrased in the same way. Furthermore, Latin has none or little of the illogical idioms which have run riot in most modern tongues; or if it had them, they have not come down to us, so that we must needs use a Latin substantially free from such difficulties.

One great claim of the Esperantists (and of the Idists) is that the IAL must have a regular system for the formation of derivative words, and that Esperanto (or Ido, as the case may be) has this system, while no natural language possesses it. They must have overlooked Latin in their consideration, for with *tio, itas, tor, tus, trix, arius, orius, anus, alis, icare, urire,* verbs like *calefacere* and *calefieri,* Greek suffixes like *issa, ista, ismus, izare, icus,* and many others, Latin has a machinery which has no superior. Practically all of the suffixes and prefixes of Esperanto (and of Ido) are taken from

elements used in Latin, easily recognizable by the classical scholar. Latin does not, however, normally pile suffixes one upon the other so as to form the sesquipedalian words which the Esperantists parade as proud achievements; unduly long words are permissible only when the united suffixes are commonly used together, and therefore easily apprehended.

Above all, Latin has a fixed standard of meaning, recognized by all men as valid, and not depending upon the decree of some council which makes decisions when cases come before it; Latin usages are embodied in the literature of twenty centuries, which is not a court to which men may appeal for decisions, but a court whose decisions are on record, ready for consultation. When a thought has been expressed in Latin, there can be no doubt what it means; the significance of those words and forms is not open to dispute.

Latin, indeed, from the time when it became the language of government around the Mediterranean and through Western Europe, has never ceased to be an international language, even apart from the modern forms of it which are spoken as the national languages of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Roumania, Central and South America, and other countries. Until comparatively recent times it was the language of university instruction throughout Europe. It is to-day the language of the technical terms of Botany, Anatomy, Medicine, Zoology, and in great part of Chemistry; the first publication of a newly discovered plant, to be valid, must be composed in Latin, to secure precision of meaning and international intelligibility, and the prescriptions of physicians are written in Latin, to prevent dangerous or fatal misunderstandings. Many books and shorter articles intended for an international public are still composed in Latin. Latin is still the official language of the Roman Catholic Church, in whose priesthood it has a great body of cultivated and fluent speakers. In various places in this country, and presumably also in other lands, small societies exist for the speaking of Latin: for example, the *Societas Gentium Latina* of New York City (President, Herbert C. de V. Cornwell, M.D.), which is now nearly ten years old and holds, twice monthly except in the summer months, meetings

which are conducted in Latin exclusively, for all purposes, business, literary and social.

VIII. The Choice for the IAL.

Of the three languages which are the most prominent objects in consideration in our quest, English stands foremost in present wideness of use, favored by commercial considerations; Esperanto is the easiest to learn; Latin conveys the thought with unquestionable exactitude. Doubtless because of these special features of the languages concerned, the different investigations of the problem have not led to uniform results.

The Northern Peace Congress, held at Stockholm, Sept. 4-5, 1919, caused an investigation of the preference for the IAL to be made. To this end, letters of inquiry were sent to representative scholars, chambers of commerce, governmental bodies, and the like, through Europe, with some to Asia and Africa; but to avoid any unfair advantage to English, French and German, no letters were sent to Great Britain, France, and Germany. Of fifty-nine replies printed in the *Nordisk Freds-Kalender* (No. 3, Stockholm, 1919-1920), four were non-committal, thirty-two favored English, four favored English and some other language jointly; the nearest competitor was French, with eight first choices and two choices jointly with English. Ido, Latin, Esperanto, Spanish, German received each a few votes. The overwhelming choice of English is in harmony with the working of the natural forces of trade and colonization; at the same time, the suggestion of Professor Niedermann, of Bâle, has much merit: that every English-speaking person learn French, that every French-speaking person learn English, that all others learn either French or English. But the objections to the choice of English have already been enumerated: apart from certain factors inherent in the language, we have national jealousies and the unfair advantage in commerce, given to the speakers of the language which might be chosen as the IAL.

Another investigation was instituted by the International Research Council, at its meeting in Brussels, in August, 1919. The representatives of the United States raised the question of an international abstract journal of chemical literature, and

as no agreement could be reached as to the language in which it should be printed, a discussion of an IAL developed. An international committee[1] was appointed, which has published a report in the *Proceedings of the British Association, Section L* (Edinburgh, 1921). It reviews the advantages and disadvantages of English, Latin, Esperanto and Ido, and pronounces in favor of an invented language, though it does not decide between Esperanto and Ido. Apparently it appreciated that Ido was an improvement over Esperanto, and that Esperanto has much more vogue than Ido; and that at the same time the Esperantists are keenly jealous of any recognition which Ido may receive.

When two such investigations as these come to absolutely different results,[2] their conclusions lack convincing force, and we are at liberty to examine the ground anew, as we are doing, and to come to other conclusions, without incurring the charge of undue presumptuousness and self-confidence.[3] The writer believes that English cannot be considered for the IAL, because of national jealousies; and that the choice lies between Esperanto and Latin: Esperanto, as the invented language which has attained most influence, and Latin, as the most studied and most used of the ancient languages.

In the comparison of Latin and Esperanto, we may make the following tabulation, in the order of the qualifications listed above:

1. The sounds of Latin are to most persons easier to make than those of Esperanto. The position of the accent in Latin is slightly more difficult than it is in Esperanto.
2. Both languages have a phonetic alphabet, with complete correspondence between spelling and pronunciation.

[1]The president and the secretary of this committee are respectively Dr. F. G. Cottrell and Dr. Ward Nichols, 1701 Massachusetts Ave., Washington, D. C., from whom information and literature on the whole problem of an IAL may be obtained.

[2]Prof. A. L. Guérard, in his *Short History of the International Lauguage Movement* (Boni and Liveright), agrees neither with their results nor with the present writer's conclusions.

[3]W. A. Oldfather, *Latin as an International Language,* in *Classical Journal,* XVI. 195-206 (1921), and L. J. Paetow, *The Revival of Latin as an International Language,* in *Proc. Amer. Philol. Assn.* LI. XVII (1920), argue cogently in favor of Latin.

Typographically, the Esperanto, with its diacritical marks, is more difficult.

3. The word roots or bases of Latin have at least as much internationality as those of Esperanto, and possibly greater internationality.
4. The forms of Latin are less easy to learn than those of Esperanto; but they give, by their greater length and distinctness, a better opportunity for the hearer to appreciate their meaning.
5. The syntax of Latin bears the same relation to that of Esperanto as do the forms of the two languages to each other.
6. Latin conveys precise meanings in a way which as yet cannot be approached by Esperanto, especially in the realm of the abstract and the emotional, where precise meanings are attached to words by usage and not by form. For concrete objects, of course, terms can readily be assigned; but the shades of meaning in *mercy, pity, sympathy, compassion, commiseration, condolence,* might prove very difficult to convey with discrimination in an artificial language.
7. In the other values, peculiar to the language itself, Latin has great strength.

A. Latin develops logical thinking, since it demands the analysis of the thought; Esperanto attempts to eliminate the necessity of analyzing the thought, by removing the grammatical machinery of the language, and thereby cultivates loose thinking.[1]

B. Latin develops the idea of grammatical categories, and thereby serves as a foundation for the easier learning of modern languages and other ancient languages; Esperanto, with its intentional poverty in categories, fails in this point also.

C. Latin is the medium of one of the great literatures of

[1]Except in one particular: the excessive use of suffixes to reduce the number of the words requires some very difficult analyses of the thought, which are far too difficult to ask of anyone except a person trained in such processes. Possibly the Esperantists do not employ this machinery to the full; in that case, their claims of brevity of expression and of ability to express everything with a small number of roots, are proportionally invalidated.

the world, and its study opens the door to the understanding of that literature; Esperanto has no literature but one made to order for the purpose, which, through its lack of spontaneity, can never be really of value.

D. Latin has been and still is the subject of study of a tremendous number of persons, a number which must still greatly exceed the number of those who have studied Esperanto.

E. Latin is taught in our schools by a large number of trained teachers, constituting, as we shall see, the means by which Latin may be taught as the IAL; Esperanto has not a similar body of representatives.

F. Latin conveys the cultural inheritance of the past ages in a way in which no invented or artificial language can ever function; and in these days of radicalism any such bond with the experience of mankind in ages gone is too precious to be lightly discarded.

G. A language invented for the express purpose of being the IAL cannot serve the many other uses of a natural language with a long and glorious history; and even in our quest for the IAL, we should not overlook other values which may be secured if we choose our IAL aright.

In view of all these considerations, we believe that Latin is the best language to be employed as the IAL. We must now consider the kind of Latin which should be thus used, and how it should be pronounced; how it should be taught, and what method books there are for teaching it in this way; how the plan may be put into practice in the schools; and what results may be expected when the plan is in effect.

IX. What kind of Latin shall we use as the IAL?

Are we to look forward to the Latin of Cicero as our IAL? This is a question which must be considered with the utmost seriousness, for in the correct answering of it lies the way to success. Cicero did the Latin language a real disservice by developing the complicated periodic sentence; we have done it a second disservice by making the style of Cicero our criterion of correct Latinity. Cicero himself did not use such involved construction in his personal letters; in his conversation, we

may rest assured, he used a still simpler style. In our English conversation, as we have said, we use few subordinate clauses except those introduced by the relative pronoun, *that, if, when, because,* and an occasional indirect interrogative; we occasionally replace these by virtual synonyms. Did the old Romans do otherwise? No; the testimony is found in the plays of Plautus, where the dialogue runs in simple sentences, mostly of short clauses, with rarely any difficult complexity. In the first place, then, our IAL Latin should be couched in short and simple sentences.

The next point is, whether the Latin vocabulary is capable of expressing the objects and ideas which are new to the world since the time of, let us say, Cicero. The answer is, Yes! For Latin has been in continuous use ever since that time, even though it has been less used as a spoken language during the past century or two; and if for eighteen centuries its vocabulary kept pace with the advancing thought of the world, it is absurd to think that it could not do so for twenty centuries, just as absurd as to maintain that English, in its Anglo-Saxon form, was incapable of developing into a speech which ten centuries later should meet all the needs of a modern age characterized by mechanical inventions. In very fact, Anglo-Saxon has stood the test, but only by borrowing from Latin and Greek the materials to express the ideas; Anglo-Saxon would probably have developed the terminology out of its own word-stock, except that it found ready for use a much better and more readily usuable word-stock, namely that of Latin (and Greek[1]). If English has recourse to Latin for the enlargement of its vocabulary to meet its new wants, Latin itself can certainly express all the new ideas of the modern world. We must then speak as our IAL not the Latin of Cicero, with its restrictions as to words and their meanings, but a later and more developed form, in which many words have developed markedly toward the meanings in which they

[1]Any Greek substantive or adjective can be taken over by Latin in transliterated form, for immediate use; and this should be understood as implicit in all such discussions as the present one. Similarly, new compounds of Greek stems, even though not found in Greek itself, may be freely made and used in Latin, even as they are made and used in English and in other modern languages.

have passed into modern languages,[1] and in which there are many new words imported from many sources; in other words, the Latin of the late Middle Ages and of modern times. This Latin is astonishingly easy to one who has been reared on the Latin of Caesar and of Cicero, as may be seen by the sample printed in the London *Spectator* for May 7, 1922, in an article which advocates the adoption of Latin as the IAL.

A simple Latin, a modern Latin; yet not a bad Latin: for there is nothing in this Latin which is bad, unless we stigmatize as bad a simple form of expression and the use of words which are newly borrowed or have acquired new meanings; we might equally well refuse to employ in English such words as *automobile* and *radium*. Only in syntax are there a few changes, mostly in the direction of welcome alterations; the most noticeable point is an optional substitute for indirect discourse. This substitute is found occasionally even in Latin of the best period, where to be sure it is branded as a solecism; but before many centuries passed it became a common usage.

Our next consideration must be of the pronunciation. The "English" pronunciation has now happily been abandoned even in England except by a very few schools, and we are limited to a choice between the "Roman" pronunciation and a continental method. The Roman pronunciation, which we use in this country, is a serious and scholarly attempt to attain the pronunciation used by Caesar and by Cicero; and the excellent evidence on which it is based is collected in E. H. Sturtevant's *Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, University of Chicago Press, 1920. Every teacher of Latin should be familiar with this evidence, and able to show the doubter that we have actual testimony as to how the Romans pronounced Latin; despite scepticism on the part of some scholars, the writer has no doubt that any modern Latinist who should read a page of

[1]We must remember the good rule of translation, that the English word most like the Latin word is rarely the proper translation of it; *receive* rarely if ever correctly translates *recipere*, and *horrid* is but occasionally the proper word for *horridus*. These differences are due not to changes of meaning at the transfer into English, but to changes of meaning which took place while the word was still in Latin; even as Anglo-Saxon *fram* meant *by*, and has developed into modern English *from* with a quite different meaning.

classical Latin correctly according to the tenets of the Roman pronunciation, would be easily understood by Cicero and his contemporaries, though they would find that the reader spoke with a fairly marked foreign accent.

But this pronunciation of Latin did not continue for very many years; and in the fourth century after Christ, most of the features of the modern pronunciations of continental Europe had made their appearance. By the eighth century, practically all of them had developed; some, of course, underwent further changes, but very little of the old pronunciation of Latin which had survived into the eighth century underwent any substantial change later. If we are to use the Latin of the last few centuries as our IAL, it would be absurd to pronounce it with the pronunciation of the first century B.C., when we know the pronunciation of the last few centuries to be different; just as absurd as it would be for a continental European to learn English with the pronunciation of Anglo-Saxon. For this reason we must use one of the modern systems of pronunciation, used on the continent.

But there are several such pronunciations, differing with the countries in which they are used. For this there is an historical reason. Latin continued to be used in all these countries, as a spoken language, alongside the vernacular of the people. In some lands, such as France and Italy, the popular vernacular was but an altering or altered form of Latin; in others, such as Germany, it was an entirely different speech. In either instance, the written language was based on the same phonetic values of the letters. Later, when changes in the sounds of the vernacular took place, the same changes took place in the spoken Latin; and the two pronunciations remained identical, so far as the values of the written symbols are concerned. For this reason, the Italian reads Latin precisely as though it were Italian; the German reads Latin precisely as though it were German; the Frenchman reads Latin as though it were French, though he makes an exception in favor of the final letters, which he sounds.

Fortunately, these various systems are not so divergent from one another as any one of them is from English. Let us compare the methods of pronunciation used in Italy, in France,

and in Germany, as types; a very few added comments would cover any other method. The simple vowels are as in our "Roman" pronunciation, except that Italian and French sound *y* as *i*, French sounds *u* like French *u*, German sounds *y* like German *ü*. Of the diphthongs, *ae* is sounded as "Roman" *e*; *au* is sounded as "Roman" *au* except in France, where it is *o*; *oe* is sounded as "Roman" *e* except in Germany, where it is *ö*; *ei, eu, ui* show some variations, but are rare in Latin anyhow. Among the consonants, the most important variations are in *t, c, g,* which are palatalized before certain vowels. *T* before *e* or *i* followed by another vowel (unless the *t* is preceded by *s*), gets the sound of *ts* in Italian and in German, and that of *s* in French; *c* before *e, i, ae, y,* gets the sound of English *ch* in Italian, that of *s* in French, that of *ts* in German, while *sc* in the same position has the peculiar development to the sound of English *sh* in Italian. *G,* before the same vowels which cause the change of *c,* becomes English *j* in Italian, and French *j* in French, but is unchanged in German. The consonantal *v* develops the sound of English *v* in all three countries. *H* is likely to be lost in Italy and in France, but when intervocalic is strengthened to *k* in sound (*mihi, nihil,* often written *michi, nichil,* in late Latin); *ch* and *th* are sounded like *k* and *t,* but *ph* is sounded as *f*. *S* between vowels is likely to be sounded as English *z*. *M* and *n* ending a syllable are, to a Frenchman, likely to become a mere nasalization of the preceding vowel. The other differences among these methods, and between them and the "Roman" method, are of minor importance.

In our choice of a continental pronunciation, we must be influenced by the fact that only one method has currency outside of its own country. That one is the Italian method, which is the official pronunciation of the Roman Catholic Church, and is used by the priests of that Church and in all their schools and colleges. In this way it is familiar to a large number of persons other than Italians, and is suitable for use in speaking the IAL. The chief difficulties which we, as users of the "Roman" pronunciation, find in it are in the sounding of *ae* and *oe* like (Latin) *e*; for we are accustomed, in English words, to alter *c, t, g,* before precisely the same vowels before which the Italians alter them. To be sure, *centum* will become

Italian *chentum,* German *tsentum,* French and English *sentum*; *natio* will be Italian and German *natsio,* French *nasio,* English *nashio*—but these are not mutually unintelligible. Whether *vasa* is *wasa* as in our "Roman" pronunciation, or *vaza* as in the Italian and other continental pronunciations, it is easily understood. In short, with a few slight adjustments, the several continental pronunciations are sufficiently alike to be used as they are for the IAL, and the resulting differences to the hearer's ear will be little if at all greater than the differences between the Esperanto of a Frenchman and the Esperanto spoken by natives of other countries. To us, the Italian pronunciation is virtually the continental vowels with the English consonants; and that cannot be regarded as a difficult system of sounds. One more point: the Esperanto sounds which we have mentioned as difficult to the speakers of many languages (English *ch, j, sh, ts,* French *j,* German *ch*), are to a certain extent introduced into the sound-system of our modern Latin, but they are not necessarily to be carefully distinguished, since they are interchangeable variants, within certain limits; and if the speaker finds the sound too difficult for him, he may use a familiar sound and be understood as speaking the IAL with a French accent, or an English accent, and so on, as the case may be.

Our Latin, for use as the IAL, should be a Latin couched in short and simple sentences; it should be a late form of Latin, with the late Latin vocabulary; it should be spoken with the Italian pronunciation. Such Latin is not a bad Latin; it has had an honorable history of over one thousand years.

X. How shall this Latin be taught?

Latin, as the IAL, must be taught as a spoken language, not as one merely to be read; as the IAL, it must be read, and must be written, naturally, but the speaking of it is the primary point. If the person can speak Latin, he can certainly read it and write it for the same purposes—probably for other purposes also.

Most of our present method-books are designed for the teaching of Latin as a language to be read, and are therefore not available for our purpose without such modification by the

teacher in the presentation as would put an undue burden upon him. But in the last decade or so there has been a considerable advocacy of teaching Latin by the "direct method," that is, as a spoken language, and books have been developed for this kind of teaching. The direct method has had more vogue in England than in the United States, apparently because the standardizing of public education in this country represses new methods in long-established subjects; but it has been used sufficiently to show that it can be employed with effectiveness, and that the results justify what is said in this paper about the teaching of Latin as a spoken language. It is our plan now to describe briefly those books which are accessible to the writer, that teachers may form an idea of the suitability of each to their special needs.[1]

The Oxford University Press has made the most serious attempt to develop a series of books for the teaching of Latin as a spoken tongue, in their *Lingua Latina: the direct method under the general editorship of W. H. D. Rouse and S. O. Andrew*; the separate numbers are neat, slender books of from 63 to 138 pages each.

1. *Primus Annus,* by W. L. Paine and C. L. Mainwaring. This contains 56 lessons, printed entirely in Latin; paradigms, with grammatical definitions in Latin; rules of syntax in Latin; index of Latin words used, with genitives and principal parts, etc., but no meanings. Neither indirect discourse nor the subjunctive is given in this book. The material is to be taught by the teacher, who must be master of his subject and not merely follow the method set down in the book; the topics and points to be taught are in the book, and the division into 56 lessons does not mean that the book can be finished in 56 class sessions.

2. *Praeceptor, a master's book,* by S. O. Andrew. This explains how the teacher is to use *Primus Annus* and the subsequent volumes of the series, giving the details of the teaching of selected lessons.

[1]There may be, and probably are, other books which should be listed; but they have not come into the reviewer's hands. It might be added that no books are included which are made primarily for other than English-speaking students.

3. *Primus Annus: Vocabula Explicata,* by Theodora Ethel Wye. The words of *Primus Annus* are given in the order of their first occurrence, with definitions in Latin or by means of pictures.

4. *Decem Fabulae pueris puellisque agendae,* by W. L. Paine, C. L. Mainwaring, and Miss E. Ryle. These plays are for boys and girls in their first year of learning Latin by the direct method, and are graded in difficulty, from the very simple *Pyramus et Thisbe* to the final *Verres.*

5. *Secundus Annus,* by C. L. Mainwaring and W. L. Paine. This volume develops the use of the subjunctive (independent and subordinate), of indirect discourse, and of the participles, along with certain other syntactical features omitted in *Primus Annus.* Its problem is "to inculcate a grammatical conscience in the pupil" in regard to the idiomatic constructions of Latin. The twenty-four lessons are admirably constructed for this purpose. They are followed by paradigms and rules of syntax, and a vocabulary glossed in Latin.

6. *Lūdī Persicī,* by R. B. Appleton. The eleven plays, "original plays for the teaching of Latin to middle forms in schools with an introduction to the method of using the book in class," are graded in difficulty, and are both amusing and instructive, giving in an interesting way a considerable background of Roman life. The plays are called "Persian" not from the ancient Persians, but from the Perse School in Cambridge (England), with which Dr. Rouse, one of the general editors of this series and the active sponsor for teaching Latin by the direct method, is connected.

7. *Puer Rōmānus,* by R. B. Appleton and W. H. S. Jones. This volume is intended as a first reader; it contains the story of a Roman boy, told by himself. It embodies extracts from Horace, Vergil, Catullus, Propertius, Martial, Pliny, and other Roman writers, either quoted or used as material for the text, as well as a number of the most interesting stories of Gellius. The second part gives exercises based on the text.

8. *Rēgēs Cōnsulēsque Rōmānī,* by F. R. Dale. This volume contains extracts from the earlier books of Livy, the last one being on the *devotio* of Decius at the battle of Vesuvius. The text has not been simplified, but some changes are made because

otherwise the detached passages would not make complete sense. The vocabulary is glossed in Latin.

9. *P. Ovidī Nāsōnis Elegīaca,* edited by L. R. Strangeways. The passages are "such passages from Ovid as boys learning Latin should be familiar with." The extracts have introductions in Latin, and there are a few explanatory footnotes in Latin, as well as a vocabulary glossed in Latin.

The Cambridge University Press, of which the Macmillan Co. is the representative in the United States, offers the following books:

10. *Via Nova, or the Application of the Direct Method to Latin and Greek,* by W. H. S. Jones. This describes the handicaps and the difficulties of the direct method, as well as its advantages and how they are to be utilized.

11. *Initium: a first Latin course on the direct method,* by R. B. Appleton and W. H. S. Jones. This book "is intended for Latin beginners who have spent a fortnight on purely oral work without seeing any text-book." It consists largely of dialogues and of prose and verse renderings of familiar English selections, along with exercises of various natures. At the end, we find paradigms and a vocabulary glossed partly in English and partly in Latin.

12. *Teacher's Companion to Initium,* by R. B. Appleton. This contains the preliminary lessons to the preceding; but I cannot describe it farther, since it has not come into my hands.

G. Bell and Sons of London list the following books, but I have not seen them, since Harcourt, Brace and Co., their American representative, seemed unable to secure them:

13a. *Pons Tironum, a first Latin reader,* by R. B. Appleton and W. H. S. Jones.

13b. *Fabulae Virginibus Puerisque aut Narrandae aut Recitandae,* by R. B. Appleton.

13c. *Via Romana, a new first-year course on direct method lines,* by F. Granger.

Charles Scribner's Sons have the following series of two books:

14. *Beginners' Latin by the Direct Method,* by E. C. Chickering and H. Hoadley. The book contains fifty lessons, carefully graded, with no English except the explanatory parts

of the first seven lessons; after the lessons come paradigms, a few Latin poems (some modern and some ancient), and a vocabulary glossed in Latin. Indirect discourse in a simple form is introduced early; the subjunctive is treated in the last ten lessons. A teacher's edition of the book gives a discussion of the nature and principles of the direct method, general directions to teachers, and specific suggestions for the teaching of the individual lessons.[1]

15. *First Latin Reader,* by E. C. Chickering. The text is graded in difficulty, and concerns events of Roman history from the landing of Aeneas to the death of Cicero; most of the stories come from *Viri Romae,* and a few from Caesar and Cicero. The syntax is generally limited to Byrne's selection for the first two years, and the vocabulary is limited to Lodge's list of 1,000 for the first two years, and 500 from Lodge's list of 1,000 for Cicero and Vergil, with 100 more which are derivatives of words already used.[2] The original texts have been rewritten sufficiently to meet this plan. Suggestions for the use of the direct method are given in the introduction; exercises are given at the end of the selections. A few famous selections from Latin literature are presented unchanged in an appendix; then come the paradigms and rules of syntax, sample examination questions, and a vocabulary glossed partly in Latin and partly in English.

A privately printed book has come to our attention:

16. *Latina Latine,* by T. T. Chave, Strong City, Okla. (Press of the Wagoner Tribune, Wagoner, Okla.) This is a method for teaching spoken Latin along with printed Latin; it has many of the explanations in Latin, and is especially strong on word-formation.

[1]An adaptation of this book, in a form which stands between the old-time textbooks and the direct method, and planned to prepare for Chickering's *First Latin Reader* (our No. 15), has been made by Miss Florence Fish of the Central High School, Minneapolis, Minn., and is in use there in mimeographed form. She writes: "These lessons take eight weeks, and in the first third of the year we complete the lessons and read the first two stories in the Reader. Pupils can begin Caesar the second year."

[2]Lee Byrne, *The Syntax of High School Latin,* University of Chicago Press; Gonzalez Lodge, *The Vocabulary of High School Latin,* Teachers College, Columbia University.

We may list also the following:

17. *Colloquia Latina, adapted to the Beginners' Books of Jones, Leighton, and Collar and Daniell,* by B. L. D'Ooge (D. C. Heath and Co.). This is a series of thirty dialogues, carefully annotated, and intended to give interest to the first year's work by a moderate use of conversational Latin. It was first published in 1888, and therefore long precedes the recent movement for the direct method; the other books which have been listed above do not go back beyond about 1912.

18. *Collar and Daniell's First Year Latin,* revised by T. Jenkins (Ginn and Co.). This is not intended for the teaching of spoken Latin, but the accompanying *Teacher's Manual* gives material for the practice of the direct method in connection with its use.

It was a disappointment to the writer to find that the Roman Catholic schools used the same methods of teaching Latin as are used in other schools in this country; for the use of spoken Latin by the priesthood of that Church would lead one to expect that a special method was in use, at least in the seminaries. The proficiency in Latin is gained, however, mainly by the use of the language as the language of the classroom, in the subjects of philosophy and of theology, where the teacher lectures in Latin, asks questions in Latin, and requires replies in Latin. As the course in these subjects lasts during six years, much of the time for several hours a day, there is ample opportunity for acquiring a fluent speaking knowledge of Latin. Among Roman Catholic publications we might register the following:

19. *Guide to Latin Conversation,* by S. W. Wilby (John Murphy Co., Baltimore and New York). This contains vocabularies, questions and answers, forms of conversation, dialogues, selected "choice thoughts" from Latin writers, with appendices on the quantity of penultimate syllables, weights, measures, numbers, abbreviations, and dates. It is extremely useful in getting the ordinary conversational expressions which are of constant use.

20. *How to Speak Latin,* by S. W. Wilby (same publisher). This is a shorter book than the preceding, containing some conversations such as schoolboys might carry on, followed by more formal dialogues, some short extracts for reading, and

selected Latin proverbs or epigrammatic sayings. Like the preceding, it is a very helpful book.

We might mention also the following publications of the Loyola University Press, Chicago:

21. *Latin Hymns,* edited by M. Germing, S. J., containing in a modest volume some of the old hymns of the Christian Church, which in translation are used in practically all the divisions of the Church, and deserve to be read more than is the case. For reading in Latin, without formal translation, they furnish excellent material.

22. *Musa Americana,* by A. F. Geyser, S. J., in four series: *Patriotic Songs in Latin; Home Songs in Latin; Latin Odes in Classic Metres; Vicus Desertus, the Deserted Village, by Oliver Goldsmith, in Latin Hexameters.* The English text stands on the opposite page, and the reader feels that Latin is still a living language, capable of expressing the feelings and emotions of to-day, not merely a dead exponent of a bygone civilization.

XI. Who shall teach Latin?

The problem of where to find teachers for the more modernized spoken Latin is not so serious as it may at first sight appear. Any reasonably equipped teacher of Latin can, by a short intensive study, preferably under an instructor, but not necessarily so, prepare himself for teaching Latin by the spoken method; and the tenure of office rules which now prevail in most schools[1] will protect the present teachers during the period of transition from the old to the new method. In some ways, the new method will make greater demands on the teacher than the old method does; it will demand more mental

[1]These same provisions militate against the general adoption of Esperanto as the IAL. If Esperanto were to be accepted as the IAL, it would become automatically the first language taught in the schools in addition to English. Latin would suffer, being relegated to second place. But the teachers of Latin could not be summarily thrust out, and Esperantists set in their positions, because of the rules of the tenure of office. It would be the fate of the Latin teachers to prepare themselves in haste to teach Esperanto, even as the teachers of German a few years ago found themselves obliged to teach Spanish or French. Esperantists might not relish this outcome.

alertness and quick thinking, and a more ready command of a smaller range of words and ideas. But the rewards will be greater, in the different attitude of the pupils toward the work, and in the clearness with which results are seen, the definiteness of the progress.[1]

XII. How shall this Latin be introduced into the schools?

Our aim is to have this spoken Latin taught as the first language other than English, which our boys and girls may have the opportunity and privilege to study; further, that they shall be advised and rather urged to study it, and that they shall have not merely no obstacles thrown in their way, against their continuance of the subject, but even every encouragement to do so, with fair and proper opportunities.

To reach this goal, we should practice what we preach, by forming clubs and societies for the speaking of Latin, and we should make known as widely as possible our achievements, our plans and our arguments, by spoken word and by printed word. The editors of many of the chief daily newspapers of this country are favorable to Latin; so are many of our statesmen and many scholars in fields other than the classical languages. With the support of these, expressed through societies and organizations, and through committees, a powerful sentiment may be developed in favor of Latin as the IAL. Simultaneously, we should have schools in which the new methods could be practiced, tested, and demonstrated; we should develop new and additional text-books, since different teachers will prefer different kinds of books, and we should never rest content with what we have, but should always seek for improvement. Supported by a powerful body of opinion in responsible quarters, and a demonstration that spoken Latin can actually be taught with good results, we should be able to secure such action on the part of educational authorities of states and cities as would bring about the realization of our aims. We may be confident that college authorities will welcome the ac-

[1]Teachers who are really incompetent under the present method will probably be equally incompetent under the new method; but it is no part of a sound system of education to protect incompetents.

ceptance of such Latin for admission, and will coöperate in every way to bring the new method into the schools.

If the United States were to take the lead in this matter, and its educational leaders were to seek the coöperation of educational authorities in other great nations, our own action would speedily be matched by that of the others, if indeed they did not precede us. Some countries would act merely from the principle of self-interest; others would be urged on by the traditional strength of Latin in their schools; others would be roused to decision by sentimental reasons—notably the Romance-speaking lands, where there is an ancestral pride in Latin. In many countries, indeed, all three motives, and perhaps others, would operate. We may, then, proceed with confidence.

XIII. The Results.

There is a tendency in American education, quite natural on the part of the child, and unfortunately abetted by the parents and connived at by many professed educators and educational authorities, to make ease and interest the criteria of value. Now, other things apart, the ease of a subject is likely to be an indication of its worthlessness as an agent of education; and interest, while valueless *per se*, is quite certain to obscure to the learner the difficulty of the subject. Latin is popularly regarded as neither easy nor interesting, although it is neither so hard nor so uninteresting as popular opinion would have it. This is its status under the present method; but the new method of teaching Latin as a spoken language will make it truly live and interesting, in a way attained heretofore by only a few inspired teachers, and will greatly diminish the difficulties felt by the learners.

Latin as a spoken language will not be so easy as to be worthless, yet will be thoroughly interesting to the pupils. The sense of mastery of what is reputed to be difficult is a powerful inspiration; and the ability to converse simply in Latin, even though with but a few sentences, gives a feeling of control over the language which can be got in no other way. The pupil's attitude toward Latin will therefore be changed; and yet none of the advantages secured by the study of Latin at

present[1] will be sacrificed. Latin taught as the IAL will still yield fruits in mental discipline and in the power of clear thinking; it will not imperil the other foreign languages, but will still be an invaluable preparation for their study; it will open the door to one of the great literatures of the world—all these results, and others, will attend it; but none of these follow the study of an artificial language, which cannot have the background of a great literature. An artificial language can serve only one end, that of conveying thought; in this capacity, Latin is equally well qualified.

The IAL is to make every man able to talk with every other man, and thus by preventing misunderstandings and by facilitating the smoothing out of differences of opinion, to diminish the likelihood of war and bring general peace. Other services as well it will perform, and none of them are to be depreciated; but international goodwill is to be its greatest and supreme gift. Of old, Latin used one word, *hostis,* both for *stranger* and for *enemy,* for every stranger was likely to be an enemy; it said *militiae* 'at war,' as a natural antithesis to *domi* 'at home,' for a Roman in those days rarely went far from home except in the military service of his state. But hereafter, as the International Auxiliary Language, it may be the privilege of Latin to enable the stranger far from home to communicate his feelings and ideas, his hopes and aspirations; and the stranger, through mutual understanding, will be to his host no longer a presumptive enemy, but a peaceful friend and welcome guest.

[1]The very important investigation of the results of the study of Latin, now being carried on for the American Classical League under a grant from the General Education Board, will reveal precisely what results are now being attained.